

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-21 are currently pending. Claims 1, 9 and 15 are independent and are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed.

Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly unpatentable over Japanese Patent No. JP 2000-232458 to Yokogawa et al. (hereinafter, merely “Yokogawa”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0015967 of Sugiura.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 is representative and recites, *inter alia*:

“transmission of a reference signal to the wireless terminal communication apparatus alternately from each of the plurality of antenna bodies, wherein a range of detection of the reference signal by the wireless terminal communication apparatus is enlarged by the transmission of the reference signal alternately through each of the plurality of antenna bodies.” (Emphases added).

In the present invention, a reference signal is sent by each antenna body alternately. That is, the reference signal is sent, for example, from a first antenna body then from a second antenna body. *See, for example*, Publ. App. FIG. 3. The reference signal are not sent at the same time from the antenna bodies.

In an example from the specification, when wireless communication processing is arbitrarily made with the communication-targeted wireless terminal apparatus, the pertinent wireless communication apparatus is provided with two antennas . . . In the state where such two antennas 501, 502 having different directivities from each other are provided, the wireless communication apparatus 1 transmits a reference signal SR to the communication-targeted wireless terminal apparatuses 400 located within these directivities through these antennas 501, 502 alternately. At this time, since the reference signal SR is alternately transmitted . . . the range where the communication-targeted wireless terminal apparatus 400 can recognize the reference signal SR is enlarged. In this manner, the communication-capable distance between the wireless communication apparatus 1 and the wireless terminal apparatus 400 can be elongated. Publ. App. par. [0040].

The Office Action points to Yokogawa, pars. [0022]-0023] for the above recited element of claim 1. However, at the cited location Yokogawa appears to be describing locating a child office that has moved from a the area of key station. That is,

“when the child office moved, for example and the confirmation-of-receipt signal from the child office concerned is not received in a key station It starts with asking the subordinate of the sector unit which adjoins the sector unit managed about the child office concerned whether the child office concerned exists . . . By checking whether the child office concerned exists in the subordinate of the sector unit which carries out

sequential contiguity, the child office is efficiently discoverable.” *Yokogawa*, par. [0022].

And also,

“If the child office . . . has moved to the subordinate of other directional antennas from the subordinate of the directional antenna managed by the key station . . . In this case, it embraces having not received the confirmation-of-receipt signal from the child office . . . in the key station . . . Wireless transmission of the inquiry signal . . . using a different directional antenna . . . is carried out.” *Yokogawa*, par. [0019].

This is a best as can be gleaned from the machine translation provided to the Applicant.

As best understood, *Yokogawa* appears to be disclosing locating a child office in the adjacent sector units (areas of control by antennas?). This, apparently, is an effort to maintain communication with the child office as the child office moves through the sequential contiguity of the sector units.

However, there is no suggestion in *Yokogawa* that each antenna of a plurality of antennas is alternately used to transmit a reference signal. Indeed, it seems that *Yokogawa* transmits/receives through all the antennas when matching an antenna with a child office. *Yokogawa*, par. [0007]. In contrast to the present invention, there is no suggestion *Yokogawa* recognizes that by transmitting a reference signal alternately through the antennas, the area over which the communication-targeted wireless terminal apparatus can recognize the reference signal is enlarged. Because *Yokogawa* does not recognize the enlargement of the communication-capable area, there is no disclosure or discussion of transmitting a reference signal alternately from the antennas. Any such reading of *Yokogawa* is speculative at best, especially given the level of clarity of the machine translation that reference.

Thus, claim 1 is believed patentable over *Yokogawa*.

For reasons similar or somewhat similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 9 and 15 are also believed to be patentable.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-21 are in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Paul A. Levy
Reg. No. 45,748
(212) 588-0800